

From: Dan Reese
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 11/28/01 3:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I would like to state my opposition to the currently proposed settlement.

First, Microsoft is not being forced to repair the damage done by their illegal actions. Reparations for illegal actions should be a part of the settlement. Not only did competitors, such as Netscape, receive irreparable harm, but consumers, such as myself, have had to pay higher prices for the Windows OS and also computer hardware where an option to purchase the hardware without Windows was not available.

Second, the oversight committee doesn't seem to have the needed authority to impose penalties on Microsoft for not complying with the settlement. A large dollar amount per day for non-compliance (or something similar) should be imposable by any oversight committee. Microsoft has shown in court on many occasions that they cannot be trusted.

Lastly, why is the government settling for less of a resolution than was proposed over a year ago? Since that time, not only has Microsoft been declared a monopoly, they have also been convicted of violating anti-trust law 8 times. Why are consumers getting less from this settlement than could have been had a year ago?

We learned from the AT&T break-up that diversity will increase innovation and decrease prices. This settlement only solidifies Microsoft's monopoly position. The consequences will be a continued DECREASE in innovation and INCREASE in price.

Thank you for your consideration,

Dan Reese
Clearstone Corporation
Lindon, Utah